DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 438 SP 025 447

AUTHOR Defino, Maria E.; Hoffman, James V.
TITLE A Status Report and Content Analysis of State Mandated Teacher Induction Programs. Report No. 9057.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Content Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Program Content; Program Costs; Program Design; Program Implementation; *State Programs; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Orientation

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a 1983 national survey that focused on programmatic activity in teacher induction. Responses were obtained from various professionals from the 50 state education agencies. A content analysis of teacher induction programs already in effect was also made. The first set of questions in the survey questionnaire inquired as to whether or not the state had a teacher induction program in effect, and, if so, what type of program. The next items asked about the program's major features, including: (1) statements of goals and purposes; (2) duration of the program's operation; (3) years of involvement required of beginning teachers; (4) required orientation sessions or days; (5) professional skills examined though the program; (6) involvement of members of any higher education institutions; (7) program funding; (8) program evaluation; (9) program administration; and (10) numbers of certificates being issued to teachers entering the field in each state. Data obtained by the survey are presented in tabular format. The questionnaire is appended along with data from 11 states that have induction programs in various stages of development but not yet implemented. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

ED251438

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A STATUS REPORT AND CONTENT ANALYSIS OF STATE MANDATED TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS

M.E. Defino and J.V. Hoffman

Report No. 9057

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director

April 1984

SP 025 447

A STATUS REPORT AND CONTENT ANALYSIS OF STATE MANDATED TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS

Introduction

A combination of national trends has been observed which draws attention to the importance of understanding teacher induction, or the process of transition from student of teaching to teacher. There is an anticipated increase in demand for new teachers (between 1986 and 1990, the demand should reach 197,000 additional teachers per year; Feistritzer, 1981). Simultaneously, enrollments in teacher education programs are on the decline (Jaques, 1984). Complicating the simple supply/demand problem further is the suggestion in the report of the National Commission on Excellence (1983) that new teachers entering the profession may not be as well qualified as those trained in previous years. Thus it seems a time of crisis of national proportions in education exists with respect to the issue of who will be the teachers of our children in the future. Beginning teachers--who they are and what they are to become--are at the center of the dilemma facing the nation.

In reaction to this dilemma, The Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas at Austin has undertaken a large scale national study of beginning teachers (Griffin, Barnes, Defino et al., 1983), with the goal of enhancing our understanding of "beginning teaching" as a critical transition point in teacher development. One part of this research project has been to document and describe current developments occurring across the country, at a state policy level, in terms of programs for beginning teachers. The purpose of this report is to present the findings of a national survey of state education agencies, focusing on programmatic activity in relation to beginning teachers. In addition, a content analysis of those programs

already in effect is presented, in terms of critical features which cut across the various policy documents.

Methodology

A questionnaire and cover letter (see Appendix A) were mailed to the 50 states and District of Columbia in the second week of May, 1983. The letter specifically requested that questionnaires be forwarded to whichever individual in the state organization worked most closely with entering teachers and induction activities. In addition, it asked the person completing the form to include copies of any relevant printed materials with the questionnaire in the prepaid, return envelope. When printed materials were available, individual items on the form could be answered with a simple title and page reference to the appropriate document.

Follow-up telephone calls were made to those ten states which had not responded by the middle of June. In five cases, the form was completed by using the questions on it as the basis for a telephone interview with the appropriate individual in the state Department of Education. These procedures netted information from 100% of the states.

Respondents

Responses were obtained from one person in each of the 50 states (N = 50). Survey respondents included a variety of professionals, generally within the states' Departments of Education (DOE's). Five participants did not indicate their job titles. Of the remaining 45 participants, 26 were heads of teacher education and/or certification divisions in the DOE; six were Deputy Commissioners or Assistant Superintendents in the DOE; four directed academic or instructional divisions; three were directors of resources and/or personnel development; three had titles indicative of direct responsibility for their states' induction programs; one was in

charge of school standards, and one was in charge of policy and program development; and finally, one respondent was the coordinator of field experiences at the state university (and not within the state DOE).

Instrumentation

The two-page questionnaire used in the study (see Appendix A) dealt with a number of issues related to the topic of induction programs. The first set of questions inquired as to whether or not the state had a teacher induction program (or programs) in effect, and if so, what type it was (they were). The next 13 items asked for a variety of information regarding major features of the programs, including: statements of goals and purposes; duration of operation of the program; years of involvement required of beginning teachers; required orientation sessions or days; professional skills examined through the programs; involvement on the part of members of any institutions of higher education; program funding, program evaluation, and program administration; and, numbers of certificates being issued to teachers entering the field in each state. Finally, persons completing the form were asked to sign it and to write down their formal job titles, and addresses.

Findings

Fifteen of the states indicated that there was some level of activity in process with respect to induction programs. Specifically, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and South Carolina reported having mandated induction programs in place and operational during the 1983-84 academic year. Arizona, Oregon, and North Carolina reported that they were piloting induction programs. Four other states indicated that they were planning to implement induction programs: Kentucky, Mississippi, New Jersey, and Virginia. Correspondence and/or documents from three states--Nevada, New

Mexico, and Pennsylvania--revealed movement towards the development or consideration of proposals for beginning teacher induction programs. Six other respondents, from Hawaii, Idaho, Missouri, Vermont, West Virginia, and Washington, indicated having knowledge of programs or particular orientation sessions targeted for beginning teachers which were operating independently at the district level (as opposed to having been mandated by state legislatures and/or DOE's). One state, Alaska, reported the existence of a special preparation program available through the state university system to undergraduates planning to begin teaching in remote rural areas. Also, Nebraska has a university-based program for beginning teachers, in which they are "warrantied" by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln jointly with Doane College. These two institutions have agreed to provide inservice training to their newly graduated teachers in areas of deficiency identified while practicing their first year ("practice" in this instance referring to the professional conduct of teaching).

Data from the survey questionnaire are displayed in Table 1. In reading through the table, a "+" sign indicates an affirmative response, a "-" sign a negative response, and an empty cell signifies that no response was made to an item. Examination of the data in this table reveals several important pieces of information.

1. Of the programs reported (at whatever stage of development), eight states indicated that programmatic statements of goals and/or purposes were established.
2. The various programs had been in existence from zero to seven or more years. None of the four state-mandated programs in operation at the time of the survey had been in existence more than five years.

Table 1. Survey Responses

	Induction program?	Mandated	Recommended	Independent	Goals	Years of operation	Teachers' involvement	Orientation days	Person responsible	List of skills	Higher ed. institution	First year tching manual	Funding source	Funding dist'n	Amount annually	Total amount	Monitoring and evaluation	Mutual adaptation	Numbers of new credentials
Alabama	-																		
Alaska	+			+		7+	½ yr	-	-	+	+	+	T	-	-	-	-	+	
Arizona	+*	+*			+	0	up to 2 yr.	-	-	+	+	-	F/S	+	1000 t.chr	[illegible]	+	+	5000
Arkansas	-																		8000
California	-							-		-		-	-						
Colorado	-																		
Connecticut	-																		6400
Delaware	-																		1100
Dist. of Columbia																			
Florida	+	+			+	1	1 yr	+	+	+	+	+	S	+	2.7 mil.	2.9 mil.	+	+	
Georgia	+	+			+	3-5	var.	-	+	+	-	+	S	+	3.5 mil.	-	+	-	6000
Hawaii	-			+															
Idaho	-			+			var.	-		-	-	-	D						6000
Illinois	-																		
Indiana	-																		3800
Iowa	-																		
Kansas	-																		

* being proposed, planned, or piloted.

F = Federal
S = State
D = District
T = Teacher

BEST COPY

Table 1, continued.

	Induction program?	Mandated	Recommended	Independent	Goals	Years of operation	Teachers' involvement	Orientation days	Person responsible	List of skills	Higher ed. institution	First year teaching manual	Funding source	Funding dist'n	Amount annually	Total amount	Monitoring and evaluation	Mutual adaptation	Numbers of new credentials
Kentucky	+*	+*																	2800
Louisiana	-																		
Maine	-																		5000-6000
Maryland	-																		1350
Massachusetts	-																		
Michigan	-																		5000
Minnesota	-																		6000
Mississippi	+*																		
Missouri	-			+						-									
Montana	-																		
Nebraska	+			+		1	1 yr				+								7500
Nevada	+*																		
New Hampshire	-																		2300
New Jersey	+*							-											7000
New Mexico	+*																		
New York	-																		
North Carolina	+*			+*	+	1	1 yr+	+	-	+	+	+	S	-	-	-	-	+	3000

* being proposed, planned, or piloted.

F = Federal
S = State
D = District
T = Teacher

BEST COPY

Table 1, continued.

	Induction program?	Mandated	Recommended	Independent	Goals	Years of operation	Teachers' involvement	Orientation days	Person responsible	List of skills	Higher ed. institution	First year teching manual	Funding source	Funding dist'n	Amount annually	Total amount	Monitoring and evaluation	Rural adaptation	Numbers of new credentials
North Dakota	-							-											1200
Ohio	-																		6000
Oklahoma	+	+			+	1	var.	-		-	+	-	S	+	5 mil.	-	+	-	15000
Oregon	+*			+*	+	1	var.	-		-	+	-	S	+	15 th.	-	-	+	1500
Pennsylvania	+*																		8000
Rhode Island	-							-											
South Carolina	+	+			+	0	var.	+	+	+	+	-	S	-	-	-	+	-	3000
South Dakota	-											-							1500
Tennessee	-							-											6500
Texas	-							-											9000
Utah	-							-				-							
Vermont	-			+				-				-					+		744
Virginia	+*	+*			+	0	2 yr.	-	+	-	+	+	S	-	-	-	+		
Washington	-																		10000
West Virginia	-			+	+	5-7	var.	-		-	+	-	D	-	-	-	+		2300
Wisconsin	-			+				-		-		-							18000
Wyoming	-																		

* being proposed, planned, or piloted.

F = Federal
S = State
D = District
T = Teacher

BEST COPY

3. The number of years' participation required or expected of beginning teachers ranged from one semester to two years. In many states (and specifically in all four operational programs), duration of a beginning teacher's involvement in the program was dependent upon his/her demonstration of adequacy of identified teaching skills or competencies.
4. Three states (Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina) reported providing required orientation sessions or days for their beginning teachers.
5. Four states (Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia) noted that a particular individual in the state organization was responsible for administration of the beginning teacher induction programs.
6. Six states (Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina) reported utilizing lists of skills and/or teaching competencies in their induction programs, which the beginning teachers were expected to demonstrate and/or master.
7. Nine states (Alaska, Arizona, Florida, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia) indicated that persons from institutions of higher education were involved in the conduct and/or development of their induction programs. In some cases, college and university faculty were directly involved in the assistance and assessment of first-year teachers; this is part of the legislative mandate in Oklahoma, while Alaska and Nebraska have programs based on the university campus.

8. Five states (Alaska, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia) said they provided beginning teachers with some type of "first year teaching" manual through their induction programs.

9. Several comments can be made about the funding appropriated to the various induction programs. Only two states reported the total amount of money already consumed through teacher induction efforts as of May, 1983: Arizona ($200,000) and Florida ($2,900,000). The amount spent annually on teacher induction was reported by five states, and ranged from $15,000 to $5,000,000; the state-mandated, 1983-84 operational programs were generally in the $3-5 million range. Five states also noted that there was a formal mechanism in existence for distribution of available funds. Finally, 11 states identified funding sources for induction activities. In one case, Alaska, the teachers paid their own way through the special orientation program offered by the state university. In two cases (Idaho and West Virginia) the school districts were identified as providing the funds for induction activities. State money was utilized to finance induction program efforts in eight instances; and, in one state, federal financial assistance was being employed in the development and piloting of an induction program (Arizona).

10. Eight of the respondents (Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia) noted that specific monitoring and evaluation procedures were integral components of the programmatic induction activities in their states.

11. Five states (Alaska, Arizona, Florida, North Carolina, and Oregon) indicated that some allowance had been made for district/state mutual adaptation of induction program efforts. This was particularly true in Florida, where each district had to submit its own plan for implementing the Beginning Teacher Program. The state simply required that each plan address several core components, and districts were free to determine how each component would be included.

12. Nearly one-half of all respondents (N = 22) did not report the numbers of initial teaching credentials or certificates being issued in their states. The numbers of credentials issued by the 28 who did respond varied from 744 to 18,000. In some cases, the reports of large numbers reflected the total number of credentials issued by a state (including reciprocations, certification in additional subjects/grade levels, and so on) rather than just those initial credentials being awarded to first year teachers.

Content Analysis of State Supported Induction Programs

Fifteen of the states enclosed letters and other supplementary materials with their completed questionnaire forms. These documents were read independently by two staff members of the RITE research staff. using procedures similar to those outlined by Huling and Hall (1983) and Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall and Loucks, (1981) to establish innovation configurations, these researchers identified the major features and/or themes which occurred in states' legislation, board regulations, program packets and so on. The results of these analyses were arranged in tabular

format for ease of making comparison across states. The organizing themes or points of comparison used in this analysis are as follows:

(1) responsibility for the basic design or structure of the program;

(2) source and level of program funding;

(3) statements of program goals, purposes, or foci;

(4) primary clients and/or consumers of the program;

(5) composition of any support and/or assessment teams involved;

(6) training required of such team members;

(7) training or orientations required of beginning teachers;

(8) the team role in assessment, if any;

(9) focus of teacher assessments required by the program;

(10) instrumentation used to make the assessments;

(11) assistance or support mechanisms established by the program;

(12) possible certification outcomes for the beginning teacher; and,

(13) appeals procedures available to those exiting the induction programs.

Table 2 presents the results of the analyses of the four state programs which are currently in operation. (For a parallel analysis of the programs at various stages of development in other states, see Appendix B of this report).

Responsibility for program design. As can be seen from Table 2, state legislatures were responsible for outlining the basic design of induction programs in three states (Florida, Oklahoma, and South Carolina). In the fourth, Georgia, the state board of education established the program's design in response to a directive from the state superintendent in 1972. In all cases, the, program impetus seems to be "top-down" through the governance structures.

BEST COPY

Table 2. Thematic description of extant induction programs.

Theme or Component	Georgia	South Carolina	Florida	Oklahoma
Who has responsibility for the design of the program?	State guidelines (S.B. 672) are provided.	State provides guidelines, districts may add to them (Act 187, "Educator Improvement Act," of 1979).	State provides guidelines; each district must submit for approval a plan that meets the guidelines (CSSB549).	State provides guidelines. Districts are free to add to these; districts must have plans to justify continued receipt of staff development monies. (H.B. 1706)
What is the source and level of funding?	Approximately $3.5 million annually of state funds, distributed by contract with fiscal agents for the 17 Regional Assessment Centers (RACs).	Provision for state funds' appropriation is made in Act 187, §59-26-60. Total funds for 82-83 = approximately $527,000.	Approximately $2.7 million annually. State monies for induction are allocated on the basis of $1.70 of each staff development entitlement of $6.00/FTE.	About $5 million annually. IHE's received about $4 million to assist, while teacher consultants receive stipends of $500.
What are the program goals/foci?	To fulfill State Superintendent's mission to "certify educational personnel on the basis of demonstrated competency."	Several intents of the law are specified in §59-26-10; most pertinent is §59-26-10.e, "enable the use of evaluation standards that will aid in determining whether beginning teachers can apply fundamental teaching skills in the classroom."	To "increase student achievement."	To insure education is provided by "teachers of demonstrated ability."
Who are the program's client consumers?	Teachers eligible for or possessing a non-renewable professional (NT) certificate or non-renewable provisional (NB) certificate; in addition to all vocational teachers employed on/after 1/1/81, seeking V-series certification, after completion of 30 hours of professional education courses.	Legislation targets many groups of educators. Of concern here are provisional contract first year teachers.	All teachers not holding regular certification; teachers from out-of-state with less than 3 years of teaching experience.	"Entry level teachers:" any licensed teacher who is employed in an accredited school to serve as a teacher.
What is the composition of support/assessment teams?	Three "data collectors:" peer data collector (teacher); external data collector (from RAC); administrator data collector. (One of these must hold current, valid certificate in the same field as the beginning teacher.)	Three observers: a district office administrator; an experienced teacher; and a principal. One member is designated as "the evaluator." All must be from same school district.	Three or more team members: (1) peer teacher (same area as beginning teacher); (2) other professional educator (need not be on site); (3) building level administrator; (4) other optional members may be specified in district plan.	Three team members: (1) teacher consultant; (2) principal/AP/other school-board-designated administrator; (3) teacher educator from IHE. (One must have experience in same area as beginning teacher.) Called Entry-Year Assistance Committee (EYAC).

BEST COPY

Table 2, continued.

	Georgia	South Carolina	Florida	Oklahoma
What training is required for support/assessment team members?	Data collectors must be trained by regional assessment centers to required levels of proficiency on the assessment device (very specific program); annual updates must be provided.	Observers must complete a training program and meet acceptable levels of reliability on assessment devices. Observers are also trained in "conducting the (post-observation) conference successfully and professionally" (p. 2 of Assessments of Performance in Teaching [APT] booklet).	Must have a plan for training team members in specific areas of: (1) observational skills, (2) consulting skills, (3) knowledge of beginning teacher competencies.	No requirements located in the materials.
What training/orientation is required for the beginning teacher?	Regional Assessment Centers provide orientations to all teachers according to specific guidelines; these include being provided with copy of instrument to be used in assessment.	Each teacher is given an orientation to the assessment instrument, a copy of it and an explanation of the process to be used.	It must be a part of each district's plan to explain to beginning teachers: (a) competencies, (b) basic knowledge, (c) orientation to district, school and beginning teacher program.	None required (beginning teacher does receive copy of instrument in first EYAC meeting).
What is the team's role in assessment?	Team members are called "data collectors." They are required to interview and observe teachers two times during the year: once in the fall and once in the spring.	Team members serve as observers. Independent observations are conducted in fall, repeated in the spring if performance is judged unsatisfactory.	Must evaluate twice (at the beginning and the end) with a summative instrument. Formative evaluations throughout the year.	Each team member observes the beginning teacher three times independently.
What is the focus in the assessment?	(1) Teacher plans and materials, (2) classroom procedures, (3) interpersonal skills. Teachers plan a short instructional unit (7-10 days) and prepare a portfolio. Required interview with team as a group before teaching. Independent observations by team members.	(1) Planning (2) Instruction (3) Management (4) Communication (5) Attitude Teachers prepare three lessons for presentation as model demonstrations. Teachers assess their own performance in lessons on same form using the same criteria as observers.	Assessment must focus on "Florida Essential Generic Competencies." Procedures are left open.	(1) Human relations (2) Teaching and assessment (3) Classroom management (4) Professionalism (5) Meaningful parental input
What instrumentation is used?	Must use TPAI (state-developed).	Must use APT (state-developed).	Florida PMS recommended (state-developed); other systems allowed if seven criteria for reliability/validity are met.	Must use observation plan provided in program description (state-developed). Committee determines how to obtain parental input.
How is feedback provided?	Representative from PAC delivers and interprets assessment profiles in a private conference.	A post-observation conference is held between first year teacher and evaluator. The two other observers are encouraged but not required to attend. Observation sheets are shared and compared with teacher self-evaluations.	Results of formative conferences are used to prescribe inservice activities. Summative evaluation is used as a basis for their judgement as to certification. No procedures for commentaries of feedback are prescribed.	In the second EYAC meeting, formative feedback is offered. In the third meeting, summative feedback in the form of certification recommendations are given. Copies of observations are given to first year teachers.

BEST COPY

Table 2, continued.

	Georgia	South Carolina	Florida	Oklahoma
What mechanisms are established for providing assistance?	Teachers are provided with information regarding staff development opportunities when their scores on any competency are below recommended levels, but RACs may not actually conduct any staff development activities for them.	Identified deficiencies are to be discussed together with remediation possibilities.	Must show a plan to identify objectives, and strategies for meeting those objectives, based on screening and formative evaluations. Referred to as "Professional Development Plan." Must be kept in beginning teachers' portfolios.	EYAC must make recommendations for subsequent staff development activities after committee meeting #2.
What are the outcomes in terms of certification?	"Certification summary;" if all competencies have been satisfactorily demonstrated, teacher is given explanation of certification action. If not, teacher is given an explanation of his/her certification status (e.g., possible second year with NT certificate).	May be given annual contract, continuing contract, a second one-year provisional contract, or no contract.	Team recommends for certification/noncertification.	Recommend for certification and staff development; or recommend for second year in EYA program; or recommend for noncertification (only possible after second year in EYA program).
What are the appeals procedures?	Provision is made for district superintendent to appeal to Certification Appeals Committee through the Associate Director of Performance-Based Certification, Georgia Dept. of Education.	According to Chapter 26, §59-26-40 of Act 187, "During the one-year provisional contract period the employment dismissal provisions of Article 3, Chapter 19, and Article 5, Chapter 25, of Title 59 of the 1976 Code shall not apply." (emphasis added; sections refer to provision of formal due process hearings.)	Required part of each district's plan.	Allowed for but not required or established.

Source and level of funding. These varied somewhat, although all four programs relied upon state funds for their budget. The allocations ranged from $500,000 to nearly $5,000,000 annually (the lower limit was an extreme case; three of the four programs operated on multi-million dollar budgets). Strategies for obtaining and distributing funds also varied. Florida required a reallocation of existing district staff development monies to pay for beginning teacher program activities, whereas the others apparently were able to obtain additional revenues for their programs. Distribution schemes were state-specific.

Program goals/foci. Three of the four states have established statements of goals or intents for their induction programs in policy documents which emphasize performance-based assessment of teachers. Although the goals typically are couched in positive terms (e.g., the concern is one of ensuring that certificates are given to teachers who have demonstrated certain desired skills to some level considered satisfactory), they also seem to be predicated upon a "deficit model" (as per Ingverson, 1984). Florida is the only state which explicitly has targeted increased student achievement as a goal for its beginning teacher program (and in this case the program may have been viewed as part of a broader movement to assess all teachers in service). No evidence was available to the present authors to indicate whether or not the program is achieving this goal, and if so, to what degree.

Program clients/consumers. In identifying the primary consumers or clients of each state's teacher induction program, it was found that policies in three states' programs clearly are directed towards teachers without full or standard certificates. The fourth state, South Carolina, enacted legislation targeting many groups of educators (for example,

administrators) for assessment and improvement, although provisional contract first year teachers are emphasized. Thus, the clear tendency and apparent intention is one of quality control during the period of formal entry into professional practice.

Team composition. In all four states, more than one person has been designated to work with and/or assess the beginning teachers served by the induction programs. Policy in South Carolina and Georgia requires three observers, or "data collectors" in the latter case, to watch the classroom teaching of beginning teachers. In Oklahoma and Florida, three team members formally are designated to both observe and assist first year teachers. In all four cases, one team member is an experienced teacher and a second is a building-level administrator--most often the principal. Formal policy in three states clearly specifies that at least one member of the team must have a certificate and/or experience in the same area as the first year teacher. Oklahoma is unique in its legal requirement that one member of the team be from an institution of higher education (when feasible, the same institution from which the first year teacher graduated). Thus, allowance generally is made for the notions that: multiple perspectives in assessment are desirable; experience in a particular teaching area may serve as an indicator of expertise; in addition to the implicit one that, to some degree, teaching is a bounded activity (such that content/area will influence determinations of appropriateness in teaching behaviors).

Training for team members. Three of the four states have mandated training for the support/assessment team members. Such training tends to be limited to proper use of the required observation instruments. Two states' documents specify that reliability with the observation instrument must be achieved by team members, while information from the third indicates that

districts should provide for this. Oklahoma required no training for observation, consultation, and so on, in its legislation or state board regulations. Therefore, to the extent that required training exclusively focuses upon proper use of assessment devices, it seems reasonable to infer the presence of two themes: 1) a priority is placed upon defensible and/or "fair" assessment, as well as 2) an assumption seems to be that educators of children should know, without further assistance or training, how to work with adults.

Team role in assessment. In view of the thrust towards performance-based assessment evidenced by the goal statements, greater clarity was sought regarding the role of teams in the assessment of first year teachers. In documents relating to all four cases, team members are expected to observe the beginning teachers. Frequency of required formal observations ranged from a lower limit of one in South Carolina (a second observation is required only if initial performance is unsatisfactory), to a minimum of three by each of three team members in Oklahoma and Florida (in the last case, two observations by each person are "summative" and at least one by each is "formative"). Also as part of the formal assessment process, data collectors in Georgia are expected to interview first year teachers about their lesson plans, prior to conducting observations. Thus, by and large, the team role in assessment is one of conducting a discrete (and generally fairly small) number of independent, nonparticipant observations in the beginning teachers' classrooms to gather evaluative information.

Assessment focus. A next logical theme to emerge concerned the focus of the assessments, that is, what aspects of teaching performance were being examined through these observations and interviews? All four states have relatively broad performance areas which are studied in terms of more

specific, behaviorally stated descriptors or indicators. Florida and Georgia seem to have more refined sets of behaviors, at least in terms of quantity, to be assessed. Generally, all four states consider such skill areas as teacher planning and preparation, classroom management, interpersonal skills, and the conduct and management of instruction. These are generally consistent with much of the "process-product" teacher effectiveness research literature, as well as with conventional wisdom about teaching, although linkages between the research findings and the observation instruments vary in degrees of clarity and/or explicitness.

Instrumentation. Three of the four states formally require that a single observation instrument or set of instruments developed by the state be used to assess the classroom performance of all first year teachers in their induction programs. The fourth state has not mandated the use of a particular instrument. Rather, it recommends the state-developed instrumentation, but will accept others for use by the district provided the chosen observation instrument(s) meet seven formally established reliability/validity criteria, which are fairly stringent. Thus, at the state level, most programs operate on the apparent assumption that uniform instrumentation for all participants is desirable and perhaps contributes to the "fairness" of the assessments. (In the exception, where the ostensible goal is use of quality instrumentation, the standards of reliability and validity are such that districts have little functional choice in selecting instrumentation other than that developed by the state.)

Feedback. Provision of feedback subsequent to formally required observations also has been included in the mandates of these four states, although with varying degrees of specificity. In two cases feedback and discussion are expected to occur in the context of a meeting between the

first year teacher and the team or committee. In the other two, required private post-observation conferences are held between the beginning teacher and one member of the committee or team (specifically, the one designated "data collector" or "evaluator"). In three states it is formally required that the new teacher see and/or be provided with copies of the completed observation instruments. In only one instance located by the present authors was the first year teacher expected to evaluate him/herself for the purpose of comparison with the evaluations made by team members. However, in all four cases, classroom observational data are to be used as the primary basis of feedback given to the new teacher. Again, due to the nature of the goals and the instrumentation, an implicit deficit/quality control model seems to be operating whereby areas in need of improvement and areas adequately demonstrated are identified to the beginning teacher.

Assistance. To some degree, all four states have addressed the issue of providing technical assistance or support to the beginning teacher, in addition to providing feedback. In one state it is clearly specified that the data collector, who confers with the new teacher to discuss his/her observed performance "profile," also will furnish the teacher with information regarding staff development activities in any areas where performance is less than what the state considers to be "recommended." The other states generally require discussion of, or recommendations for, staff development or inservice training for the beginning teacher based upon weaknesses identified by the teams. However, in no instance in the documents did the present authors locate any systems for monitoring either the quality/specificity of the recommendations, or whether or not the first year teacher acts upon the recommendations made. Furthermore, no particular model for the provision of assistance was established in the policy

documents contacted (with the possible exception of Oklahoma, whereby a novice-expert or client-consultant relationship seems to have been formalized through the provision of a stipend to the individual assuming the "teacher consultant" role).

Certification outcomes. In three of the four states' formal program descriptions, an explicit link was made between the first year teacher's opportunity to receive full certification (not employment status) and successful completion of the induction program. In the fourth, it appeared to the authors that contract eligibility was associated with successful completion of the state induction program (note: the operationalization of "success" varies with each of these programs). Two of the states clearly rely upon the judgment of support/assessment teams in recommending a new teacher for certification. In Oklahoma the committee decision-making process follows a branching pattern, whereby a recommendation for noncertification may be made only after the teacher has spent a second year in the induction program. Georgia similarly affords the option of a second year to demonstrate recommended levels of competence in the teachers' classroom performance.

Appeals procedures. A final point of variation across the mandated programs concerned appeals procedures for beginning teachers after decisions regarding certification have been made by a team or committee. In one state, Florida, districts are required to include an appeals component in their plans for compliance with the mandate. In the others, such procedures seem to be allowed for but are not anywhere mandated; neither are they explicitly prohibited. South Carolina, however, has established that the formal due process procedures to be utilized with career teachers vis-a-vis

firing/hiring decisions, are not to be utilized with teachers still seeking certification.

Discussion

A variety of observations regarding these findings are possible. First of all, the majority of states with programs either in operation or in progress were in the southern half of the United States. This is largely consistent with recent national demographic trends, whereby the economic and population growth experienced by states in the so-called "Sun Belt" lends itself to the hiring of relatively more teachers than might occur elsewhere. However, Sandefur (in Jaques, 1984, p. 4) anticipates that across the country, "more states (will be) mandating an induction year prior to certification."

Second, there was a possible discrepancy noted between our own findings and those reported in a similar survey conducted by Andrews Associates (1983). Specifically, Andrews Associates (p. 2) report that "Connecticut, California, Kentucky, and West Virginia all have formal commitments to the development of beginning teacher assessment/assistance programs." In the present survey, respondents from Connecticut, California, and West Virginia are not identified as having made such a commitment at the state level. Several explanations for such a discrepancy are possible, and all are tied directly to the general limitations of RITE's work: 1) responses may have been a function of the way RITE's questions were worded, such that appropriate information was not obtained; 2) responses also might be a function of the time period during which data collection occurred; and 3) survey information might not have been properly interpreted by the RITE staff.

Third, a broad picture of greater consistency than variation across programs and sites emerged through the identification of themes in the programs. Subsequent use of the themes as a sorting device/organizer for information about proposed and developing programs (see Appendix B) further bolstered an image of overall similarity. In addition, this parallels findings of cross-site similarity observed in earlier studies in clinical teacher education experiences (e.g., Griffin, Barnes, Hughes et al., 1983). Among the most salient points of cross-program similarity are: the designation of multiple individuals from varying role groups as assessors of beginning teachers' job performance; the specification of behaviorally-stated skills or competencies which beginning teachers must demonstrate; the required use of particular instrumentation and of observations for making judgments about beginning teachers' performance; the provision of some type of support; and, the formal, legal establishment of a contingency between successful completion of the program and receipt of full teacher certification.

A fourth point of discussion concerns the reasons for this consistency. That is, why are most programs focusing upon assessment in demonstrated teaching competencies, reflective of deficit models which apparently equate the ability to demonstrate certain skills with satisfactory teaching and learning? Why do most rely upon teams of assessors/evaluators with varying roles? What research exists to show that the mechanisms, processes, and structures being created in most policies are addressing and/or remediating the needs of new teachers (particularly those needs already established in issue-oriented literature; see, for example, the review by Griffin, Barnes, Defino et al., 1983)?

To date, very little hard data seem available in relation to these questions (possibly due to the newness of the programs). RITE was able to obtain one district-level document containing an evaluation study of its implementation of a state-mandated program; however, it is not known if the results it contains can or will be utilized to improve or further adapt the induction program to the local setting. In addition, as more states do implement induction programs, the press for evaluative information about them might be expected to increase (e.g., are assessment procedures linked to goals; to what degree are goals being met, and with what effect on the profession; and so on).

Until such time as evaluations of the induction programs are available, however, it seems that the teaching profession may be guilty of assuming that a well-intended reform is, in fact, achieving its purpose. The practice of latching onto a few precedents and applying them to new settings without critical study seems tenuous at best, although perhaps understandable in view of apparent widespread and strong dissatisfaction with the quality of teachers and teaching in the United States. The most significant concluding remark which can be made, then, is that research examining the translation of induction program policies into practice is necessary to enlighten further decision-making in this area.

Summary

This study reveals that the once neglected life of first year teachers has in the course of just a few years become the focal point of considerable activity. State mandated induction programs are proliferating at a rate almost too rapid to monitor. Despite this almost frenetic level of activity there is a remarkable consistency to the programs being implemented. Clearly, programs in certain states are emerging as models for other states

to adopt, either wholeheartedly or in some piecemeal fashion. The point to be made in this regard is that adoption is not tied at this point in time to data-based evaluations of these programs. What will happen as data do become available, in terms of discriminating valuable program features from those of less utility, is not clear at this time. Given the massive level of expenditure of resources, however, it appears doubtful that major program revisions will be easily achieved.

References

Andrews Associates. (1983). Survey of beginning teacher programs. Report submitted to the Virginia Department of Education.

Feistritzer, C. E. (Ed.). (1981). The American Teacher. Washington, DC: Feistritzer Publications.

Griffin, G. A., Barnes, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., Hoffman, J. V., Hukill, H., & O'Neal, S. (1983, May). Teacher induction: Research design for a descriptive study. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Austin, TX.

Griffin, G. A., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., Jr., O'Neal, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., & Hukill, H. (1983). Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study (Rep. No. 9025). Austin, Tx: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Heck, S., Stiegelbauer, S. M., Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. (1981). Measuring innovation configurations: Procedures and applications. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Huling, L. L., & Hall, G. E. (1983, August). Innovation configuration analysis. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Ingverson, L. (1984, April). Trends in in-service education. Mimeographed page.

Jaques, M. G. (Ed.). (1984, March). Education majors continue to drop; other degrees climb. Teacher Education Reports, p. 4.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1873, April). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC.

Sandefur, J. T. (1983, March). Testing to assure teacher competency: A public mandate. Paper presented at the Educational Testing Service Invitational Conference, Chicago.

Appendix A

Cover Letter and Survey Form

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712-1288

Research and Development Center
for Teacher Education
Education Annex

May 11, 1983

Dear

The Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program of the R & D Center is beginning a new, major research effort focused on beginning teachers (i.e., those who have never previously had full-time employment as teachers) and their experiences, perceptions, and observations during their first year of full-time teaching. We ask your help in this effort.

We are specifically concerned with induction (the process of transition from student of teaching to teacher) and induction programs (systematically planned and implemented processes conducted during the first year of teaching and directed towards stated outcomes). The reason for this letter is to find out about state-level participation in induction programs (sometimes called Beginning Teacher Programs).

If you are not the appropriate person in your organization to respond to the attached brief questionnaire, would you kindly forward this letter and the enclosed questionnaire to the individual you feel is best able to respond to the questions, in terms of induction activities, in your state?

In the interest of saving time, we ask that any pertinent documents, including statements of policy, legislation, regulations, and so on, be enclosed and forwarded to us with the attached form. By doing this, the person responding may simply indicate the title and page numbers of enclosed documents containing the requested information, rather than have to rewrite the information on the questionnaire form.

Thank you for your assistance with this preliminary information-gathering phase of our work; we appreciate the time and effort expended on helping us to develop our study and, ultimately, make recommendations regarding teacher induction.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director
Research in Teacher Education

Enclosures

1. a. Does your state have a teacher induction program(s) as defined in the letter accompanying this questionnaire?
____Yes ____No

b. Type of induction program (check one):
____Mandated by state legislature (or other major governing body)
____Nonmandated program
____Isolated programs operating independently at district level

2. Major features of the induction program(s)

a. Goals/purposes of the program(s): please provide title and page numbers of document(s) enclosed which describe these.

b. How long has the program been in effect? (If several exist, please indicate their average duration of operation.)
____1 yr. ____2 yrs. ____3-5 yrs. ____5-7 yrs. ____7 or more yrs.

c. Duration of the beginning teacher's involvement in the program (check one):
____first weeks ____first quarter or semester ____first year
____beyond first year of employment ____varies with individual
____varies with program ____other (please specify)_____

d. Are orientation days, specifically designed for new teachers, mandated by your state? ____Yes ____No If Yes, how many? ____

e. Who is responsible for administering your induction program at the state level:

_____
(Name/Title)

_____
(Address)

_____

_____

f. Is there a set of professional skills included in the induction program(s)? ____Yes ____No

Please provide title and page numbers of enclosed document(s) containing this information.

g. Does the program involve participation by members of any higher education institutions? ____Yes ____No If Yes, will you please note title and page numbers of document(s) describing their roles?

h. Do you provide beginning teachers with any sort of manual for first-year teaching? ____Yes ____No If Yes, will you please furnish us with a copy?

i. Funding: Please indicate title and page numbers of document(s) which address these questions.

What is the primary source of the funding?

How are funds distributed by the state to the school districts?

How much state money is spent on teacher induction:
annually?_____ to date?_____

j. Monitoring and evaluation: Please provide title and page numbers of document(s) which respond to these questions.

How is the program monitored?

If the program is being or has been evaluated, what criteria are/were used for the evaluation?

k. Is there provision for adaptation of the program to reflect local settings? If yes, what are those provisions?

l. Please estimate the number of people who will be receiving teaching certificates/credentials this year from your state.

m. Name, Title and Address of person completing this form:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your time and cooperation in completing this questionnaire. We hope to use this information to better understand state-level participation in teacher induction programs? (Please return the completed form and all related documents to RITE in the envelope provided.)

Appendix B

Report on State Level Induction Programs Which Are in the Process of Development

Appendix B

Eleven states submitted descriptions (in varying detail) of induction programs which were in various stages of development but not yet implemented. (The data regarding these programs are presented in Table 3, at the end of this appendix; the same format is followed in this table as was used in Table 2.) One program is directed by an institution of higher education; the others all appear to reflect an impetus through established state-level channels (either legislative or DOE). Of the seven which are clearly state-driven efforts, six have established target dates for program implementation. Five of these are within the next two years.

Information was not always available with regard to funding levels and sources. In two cases, federal financial assistance was being utilized to support the operation of pilot programs. Materials from the others indicated that state monies were projected to be the source of operating funds.

Six states have established program goals and foci (five of these have the most immediate starting/implementation dates). Five have stated goals in terms of making certification available to only those teachers who can demonstrate acceptable levels of instructional performance while on the job. The sixth, the "Teacher Warranty" program offered in Nebraska, has remediation of any areas of deficiency as its goal (thereby again implying the existence of some performance standards considered "sufficient"). As was the case with programs in operation, the specificity in skill areas for assessment varied. Virginia, like Oklahoma, has established a relatively small number of broad domains for assessment; whereas North Carolina formally will be concerned with competence in a minimum of 49 skill areas, in addition to others unique to particular teaching areas.

Consistent with most programs already in effect is the fairly clear targeting of beginning teachers and teachers new to the state as intended clients of the induction programs. It is interesting to note that as many as three years' participation may be required in various programs. Again, this determination is generally contingent upon performance: Virginia is an exception, requiring two years' participation regardless of how rapidly the teacher demonstrates acceptable classroom performance.

Only two of the states planning or proposing teacher induction programs have defined explicitly the number of persons, and the role groups, to be working with new teachers in a team or committee context. In both of these cases, the teams or committees are to be comprised of three persons each. Both states require that a school administrator and practicing teacher educator from an institution of higher education be on the team, as does the Oklahoma program. Provisions are made for instances where such formal team composition requirements cannot be met, in practice. The third team member is an experienced teacher in both states, though one specifies a "master teacher" (Arizona; apparently intending to establish an apprentice-expert relationship) and one a "resource teacher" (Kentucky). Five other states' documents indicated that such issues as team existence and composition would be decided by the various districts, within guidelines to be established by the states. Documents from the remaining states did not supply information about support/assessment teams.

Five of the states indicating that more than one person will be involved in the assessment of beginning teachers also supplied information that the observers would be trained for this purpose, reflective of commonly held views of measurement and/or evaluation. Arizona seems unique in its provision for an "external data collector" (Kelley, 1982) who is trained

specifically for the assessment of performance-based teaching competencies included on the required instrumentation (closely patterned after the Georgia program), but is not a member of the beginning teacher's support committee.

Nine of the eleven states' documents did not provide specific information concerning the provision of orientation days and/or training, directly related to the induction program, to the beginning teachers. Personal communication from one official in a state agency stated that planning for such orientation days had begun. Only one of the eleven states already had established an orientation day for its beginning teachers entering the induction program. Attendance was formally sanctioned through the provision of stipends to cover the new teachers' expenses in traveling to the session.

Materials from six of the eleven states proposing, planning, or piloting induction programs did not address directly the issue of possible roles which an assessment team might play in the evaluation of beginning teachers. One of the states specified only that multiple assessors would review each teacher in the induction program. All five states with detailed, codified information regarding the intended roles of teams in the assessment of new teachers included observation of classroom performance as a key component; two of these explicitly required a certain number of observations. In one case, two observations by each team member are the minimum; in the other, three observations by the resource teacher. Two states also indicated that teams may or should consider other information in addition to classroom observation data when assessing the beginning teacher. Policy in Arizona, specifically, requires that team members review a

portfolio of the instructional unit and interview the new teacher, as well as observe performance.

Criteria for assessing the new teachers were not established clearly by a majority of those states in the proposal or planning stages. Documents from one state noted that the professional judgment of the team members would be relied upon for a determination of successful program completion. Four of the remaining states are ones which have formally established varying numbers of teaching competency areas; and it is in terms of performance in these competencies that teachers are supposed to be assessed. Areas were consistent, generally, with those of established programs, including planning, management, and pupil evaluation, for example.

Information concerning instrumentation or assessment tools to be used in evaluating new teachers in the induction programs also was not located in the majority of cases. Arizona, piloting its program at the time the survey was conducted, specified instrumentation to be used in both the basic skills assessments and the performance assessment of its new teachers. One other state was planning to adapt an extant performance assessment tool, already used with teachers in service, for use with new teachers. Information from two states indicated that paper-and-pencil tests of basic skills would be selected for use with teachers entering the profession, and one (Virginia) provided for the use of several methods of data collection.

Documents from seven of the eleven states provided no clear information on the issue of whether or not teachers in the induction program were to receive feedback, and if so, how they were to receive it. One state's proposal included language to the effect that a system for providing immediate feedback needed to be established; one specified that post-observation conferences would be held; and, another's stated that

teachers in the program would receive feedback about their performance in the various skill areas assessed by the paper-and-pencil instrument. The remaining two states' policies established contrasting mechanisms for providing beginning teachers with feedback: North Carolina formally allows for the involvement of the beginning teacher in determining his/her own needs assessment together with team members during a structured interview; while Arizona's policy calls for provision of written feedback to each teacher from each of the team members. Feedback in the latter case should describe the beginning teacher's performance strengths and weaknesses, as determined by his/her performance profile on each team member's observation instrument. Thus, in this area, attention seems to be most closely focused upon the establishment of some mechanism for returning information to the beginning teachers, with little apparent formal consideration given to its content, or how the information is to be used for further decision making.

Interestingly, about half of the states in Table 3 had given some consideration to the provision of assistance to beginning teachers in their policies and/or documents (four did not). Among those which did, a fair amount of variation with regard to technical assistance was observed. For example, at one extreme, Virginia's proposal includes a requirement that each new teacher receive counseling and advisement (not in terms related to any particular model) of how to improve instruction regardless of the teacher's observed initial level of performance. At the other, North Carolina's plan states that once his/her needs have been assessed, it is left to the beginning teacher to request support services. A fairly well-articulated sequence of formal events and subsequent staff development activities is, according to the documents, set into motion by the beginning teacher's request. In between these extremes, Arizona's pilot program and

New Mexico's planned program call for the committee and new teacher to work together to generate a relatively specific staff development plan based on teaching performance assessment profiles (again, no particular model for collaboration, supervision, etc., is identified). The committee is supposed to help identify workshops, courses, and so on, to improve the rew teacher's classroom performance. While documents from both North Carolina and Arizona enumerate a variety of staff development strategies appropriate for use with new teachers (e.g., observation of other teachers, videotape analysis, workshop participation), the remaining four states are somewhat vague in their written provisions despite having formally allowed for some means of assistance.

Similar to the situation regarding formal mechanisms for assistance, information from nearly half of the eleven states in Table 3 does not address directly the question of possible certification outcomes for teachers exiting the proposed induction programs. Information from four states indicates that beginning teachers may take two years to successfully complete the program (often the success is defined in terms of demonstration of competencies) to be eligible for certification. One of these four states formally plans to require two years' participation on the part of all beginning teachers; the remainder will require a minimum of one year, although the new teachers may take as long as two years for completion. At the end of these time periods (and in the one case where a time frame was not specified), the beginning teachers are recommended, or become eligible, for full or regular certification. If they have not been successful by the end of the specified time period, then in at least one state (Arizona) policy dictates that such new teachers may not continue to teach there (reflecting the common view that certain minima must be surpassed).

Finally, almost no information pertaining to appeals procedures was located in the documents accompanying completed surveys from these eleven states. The legislation in Mississippi identified the appeals process to be used in the event of any changes in certification status; because the present authors could find no stipulations to the contrary, it was presumed that this section of the law could be applied to the case of first year teachers. Similarly, New Mexico's mandate indicates that the other teacher evaluation system components already established will remain in effect.

In conclusion, it seems that the themes generated by content analyzing documents pertaining to extant programs also serve as an appropriate "sorting device" for information pertaining to programs which are still in planning/proposal stages. This lends further credence to the notions that 1) greater similarity than differences exists across programs, and 2) some states with operative programs are being perceived as exemplars to be mimicked (to one degree or another) by those just beginning to take action with regard to new teachers entering the work force.

BEST COPY

Table 3. Thematic description of induction programs in the proposal, planning or piloting stages.

	Arizona	Kentucky	Mississippi	Nebraska
Program title/status	Teacher Residency Program (pilots are in first year of operation).	Performance Assessment Internship (implementation target date 1985-86).	Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Development has yet to formulate and name a plan (to be presented to State Board of Education, August 1984, with pilots planned for 84-85 and 85-86).	Teacher Warranty through University of Nebraska-Lincoln and Doane College.
Impetus/mandate for program arose from	State Board of Education	State Board of Education	Mississippi Legislature (Code of 1972, §37-3-2)	UN-L and Doane College
Source/level of funding	State/federal sources. First year pilot effort cost $200,000; approx. $1,000/teacher is estimated annual cost.	Local education agencies. [No dollar amount specified.]	State will compensate Commission members according to provisions in §25-3-69 and §25-3-41. Program costs to be determined [no dollar amount specified].	No information available.
Program goals/foci:	"(a) assure the public that only teacher residents who have demonstrated basic reading, writing and math skills, knowledge of specific teaching areas and acceptable levels of on-the-job teaching skills and behaviors are certified, (b) ensure a high probability of success for teachers who become certified, (c) advance the professional stature of teachers and teaching, (d) provide a means for teacher education institutions to monitor performance of their graduates and improve their teacher education programs." (Kelly, 1982)	"1. assure the public that only candidates who have demonstrated an acceptable level of performance are certified; 2. advance the professional stature of teaching; 3. assure a high probability of success of teachers who become certified; and 4. assist teacher education institutions in monitoring the performance of their graduates and subsequently improve their teacher education programs." ("Position of the State Board of Education Concerning the Performance Assessment of Candidates for New Teacher Certification in Kentucky," no date.)	The commission is to prepare a plan incorporating at a minimum the elements contained in §37-3-2.	Provision of remediation to teachers in their first year with identified areas of deficiency.
Program clients/ primary consumers:*	Beginning teachers and teachers new to Arizona; participate in it for two years.	First-year teachers, for the first year; second year of participation will be available to those who fail to complete the internship successfully.	New teachers or teachers new to MS; up to three years, with provisional certificates issued for each of the one-year periods.	Newly graduated teachers from UN-L and Doane College.

* many pieces of legislation are directed to certification of all types of professional educators. For the present purposes, the varying definitions of who qualifies for entrance into the induction program is focused upon in this row of the chart.

BEST COPY

Table 3, continued.

	Arizona	Kentucky	Mississippi	Nebraska
Composition of support/assessment teams	Three-member Staff Development Committee (SDC): one practicing master teacher; one practicing school administrator (preferably the building principal); one practicing teacher educator responsible for preservice teacher education. "'External data collectors'...will be selected (and)... assist...by providing evaluation and other services." (Kelley, 1982)	Three-person professional team, including a resource teacher, the school principal, and the teacher educator from a state-approved teacher training institution. Should institution decline, appointment from local school district will be made.	To be determined by the Commission and/or local school districts.	No information.
Training for support/assessment team members	Training in the assessment of performance-based teaching competencies will be provided by Arizona Residency Program staff to all external data collectors and all SDC members.	The position paper by Kentucky State Board of Education indicates that the 3-person team will receive "special training in the supervision and assessment of the designated generic teaching performance areas." (p. 2)	None explicitly described in the legislation.	No information.
Training/orientation for beginning teachers (relating to the induction programs)	One-day orientation to the assessment procedures and purposes of the two-year program; held prior to beginning of the fall public school semester. Beginning teachers ("residents") receive stipends to cover expenses.	None specified in the position paper.	No orientation days specified in legislation.	No information.
Team role in assessment	External data collector, master teacher, principal and teacher educator review portfolio of the unit, interview the resident, and independently observe the classroom at least two times per year (once in fall, once in spring). Resident chooses the subject/class to be observed.	Each member of committee observes teacher a minimum of 3 times per year. Resource teacher spends 20 hrs. per year observing the intern teacher.	Observations of "on-the-job performance" are required in the legislation (§37-3-2.9). Reports of evaluations based on "on-the-job performance" are to be "signed by the school administrator or supervisor who conducted a major part of the class observation and the principal or superintendent...There will be two (2) signatures on each report." (§37-3-2.11)	No information.

BEST COPY

Table 3, continued.

	Arizona	Kentucky	Mississippi	Nebraska
Focus in assessment	Competencies which are believed to be essential for all resident teachers: "(a) Assessing student needs. (b) Planning and implementing instructional strategies. (c) Developing positive relationships with students. (d) Monitoring and communicating student progress. (e) Evaluating the instructional programs. (f) Using support services, and (g) Managing the classroom." (Kelley, 1982, p. 3)	No competencies or criteria for successful completion of internship are specified in the position paper, other than this: "Successful completion shall be determined by the collective professional judgement of the internship committee." (p. 2)	No competencies or criteria for identifying adequate "on-the-job performance" are specified in the legislation.	No information.
Instrumentation	The Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments (TPAI) for the classroom observation component; the Arizona Teacher Proficiency Examinations (ATPE) for assessment of basic skills and professional knowledge.	A to-be-identified "pencil/paper type instrument" to assess knowledge of the potential interns; no specific observation assessment device was identified or required in the position paper.	A to-be-identified* basic skills examination of common knowledge in the specific cognitive teaching area; and a to-be-identified* observational instrument. *The Commission established by §37-3-2 will select these.	No information.
Provision of feedback to beginning teacher	Assessment profiles are given to all SDC members, which show competency areas of deficiency/proficiency. SDC members identify strengths and weaknesses to resident in writing. Continuous assessment evaluations (beyond the minimum two) may be performed.	Intern candidates are to receive quantitative feedback on strenths and weaknesses in specific knowledge/professional content areas from the pencil/paper test. No other provisions for direct observation feedback are stipulated.	"...needs for improvement...are determined through the evaluation of on-the-job performance." §37-3-2.12:559-560.) Not clear whether this information is to be given to the beginning teacher.	No information.
Provision of assistance to beginning teacher	A staff development plan will be generated by the SDC and the intern, based upon the assessemnt profiles, which specifies appropriate activities, release dates, etc. Release time is provided to both resident and master teachers for purposes of classroom observation, observation and analysis of videotape models, and workshop participation. SDC is to assist the resident in identifying workshops/inservice courses that will improve the resident's classroom performance.	Assessment Committee is to meet with intern teacher "a minimum of three times per year for evaluation and recommendation...A resource teacher will spend 70 hours working with the intern.. ..50 of these hours may be in consultation other than class time or attending assessment meetings." ("Position," n.d., p. 3)	Each district is to develop a plan to provide in-service training for beginning teachers; plan is to include means of addressing needs for improvement which have been identified through observations. Cooperative and third party arrangements are acceptable. (§37-3-2.12:557-562.)	Inservice training will be provided through UN-L and Doane College.

BEST COPY

Table 3, continued.

	Arizona	Kentucky	Mississippi	Nebraska
Certification outcomes	Successful performance leads to full (renewable) certification. Failure to demonstrate proficiency within the two-year period means no renewable certificate is issued and the individual may not continue teaching.	Provision is made for the intern experience to be repeated at least once if the committee feels the intern has not shown successful completion.	Evaluation reports signed by the school administrator or supervisor who conducted most of the classroom observations and the principal or superintendent will contain recommendations concerning regular certification.	No information.
Appeals	None described in available materials.	None described in position paper.	Hearings before the commission or its designated subcommittee are to be held in the event of any certification change. Aggrieved parties may appeal the commissions's decision within ten (10) days to the State Board of Education. State Bd. selects a hearing officer for a hearing de novo within thirty (30) days after receipt of the appeal. The hearing officer's decision is final.	No information.
Program title/status	An initial-year teaching program proposal is anticipated in the next session of the Nevada legislature. (Macdonald, pers. comm., 1983)	State Department of Education is presently planning an induction program. (Klagholz, pers. comm., 1983)	Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan; State Board of Education is presently disseminating implementation guides to districts.	Quality Assurance Program; to be implemented for 1984-85, and presently being piloted.
Impetus/mandate from	No information provided.	No information provided.	State Board of Education.	State Board of Education
Source/level of funding	No information provided.	No information provided.	No information provided.	Projected to be from state sources; no specific dollar amounts were provided.

BEST COPY

Table 3, continued.

	Nevada	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina
Program goals/foci:	No information provided.	No information provided.	"Improving instruction is the intent of the teacher performance evaluation component of Provision III of the New Mexico Staff Accountability Plan ..." (Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan: An Implementation Guide, 1983, p. 1).	A list of 49 core competencies expected of all initially certified teachers, in addition to specific teaching area competencies. Also, provision of a support system consisting largely of technical assistance services, where both needs assessments and service delivery are conducted by persons completely separate from the certification decision-making process. Both needs assessments and service delivery are to be conducted by "one unit," rather than different ones. (Report on the Quality Assurance Program, 1981, p. 38).
Program Clients/ Consumers	No information provided.	No information provided.	"... all teaching personnel will be included in the process at least once within the life of the individual's certificate." (Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan: An Implementation Guide, 1983, p. 2.)	All initially certified teachers (may take up to three years).
Composition of support/assessment teams	No information provided.	No information provided.	No team is required by the mandate.	Still to be determined, although the report calls for "cooperative activity among elementary and secondary schools, community colleges and technical institutes, and the four-year senior institutions of higher education in North Carolina." (Report on the Quality Assurance Program, 1981, p. 48)

BEST COPY

Table 3, continued.

	Nevada	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina
Training for support/ assessment team members	No information provided.	No information provided.	Each district's plan must "provide training in observation techniques, conference skills, and growth planning to all participants." (Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan: An Implementation Guide, 1983, p. 5.)	No training specified for those persons who would be providing technical assistance through the technical assistance program. Members of the Teacher Certification Team (those who review and evaluate the initially certified teachers' performance for the express purpose of recommending/not recommending for continuing certification) are to be "trained for this purpose and...have demonstrated their competence in review procedures." (Report on the Quality Assurance Program, 1981, p. 40)
Training/orientation for beginning teachers	No information provided.	No information provided.	See above.	None described in the Report; however, Assistant Director of the Quality Assurance Program has indicated that oreintation days are being planned (Patterson, pers. comm., 1983).
Team role in assessment	No information provided.	No information provided.	Those whom the district chooses to use as assessors will "conduct multiple observations of classroom performance to determine the presence and extent of competencies demonstrated." (Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan: An Implementation Guide, 1983, p. 6.)	Teacher certification Team (not those involved in technical assistance) reviews performance of teacher when he/she applies for continuing certification by observing him/her and reviewing pertinent data in relation to core and specific area competencies.
Focus in assessment	No information provided.	No information provided.	Six essential teaching competencies adopted by the State Board of Education, plus any additions required by the local district.	Teacher performance in relation to core and specific area competencies; "other pertinent data," which may include self-evaluations, pupil outcome measures, parent-student reports, etc.
Instrumentation	No information provided.	No information provided.	Districts must develop or identify an observation instrument based upon established competencies.	As planned, a modification of the North Carolina Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument. (Patterson, pers. comm., 1983)

BEST COPY

Table 3, continued.

	Nevada	New Jersey	New Mexico	North Carolina
Provision of feedback	No information provided.	No information provided.	A two-step process in post-observation conference: first, ensure adequacy, accuracy, and completeness of record obtained; second, identify strengths and areas where growth can occur (must be related to established teacher competencies).	Through the technical assistance component, needs assessments are conducted jointly with the beginning teacher by means of a structured interview in which consideration is given to other data, from observations, self-evaluations, etc., relative to the core competencies.
Mechanisms for providing assistance	No information provided.	No information provided.	Districts must provide for a written growth plan [illegible] agreed-upon areas of weaknesses; and "provide assistance through guidance, workshops, classes, or other means ..." (Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan: An Implementation Guide, 1983, p. 8).	Once needs have been identified by the technical assistance program members, it is up to the teacher to request support services. If beginning teacher requests support, then teacher and support team together determine (1) which needs are to be addressed; (2) how needs are to be addressed; (3) timeline for addressing needs. This is drawn up into a written agreement. Several means of addressing needs are available, including: individual consultation, peer consultation, observation of other teachers, workshop participation, provision of materials, or pursuit of advanced degree.
Certification outcomes	No information provided.	No information provided.	Specific "modification(s) of teacher certification patterns to emphasize the critical nature of early teaching experiences ..." are being developed. (Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan: An Implementation Guide, 1983, p. 7.)	Teacher Certification Team reviews performance of beginning teachers who have applied for continuing certification, in relation to competencies, and recommends to Regional Professional Standards Panel that they receive/not receive continuing certification. Panel in turn recommends to State Board of Education, whose determination is final.
Appeals	No information provided.	No information provided.	"Other components within a district's total evaluation system remain in effect ..." (Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan: An Implementation Guide, 1983, p. 9).	None explicitly described in Report on the Quality Assurance Program.

BEST COPY

Table 3, continued.

	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Virginia
Program title/status	Support System for the Continued Professional Development of Teachers in Oregon; presently being piloted in three districts.	Proposal for restructuring teacher education and certification, including the establishment of an induction period, is being considered by the Dept. of Education (Kautz, pers. comm., 1983.)	Beginning Teacher Assistance Program; to be implemented July 1, 1984.
Impetus/mandate from	"Oregon's educational community" (Schalock, 1/27/83); project's coordinator is with the Oregon State System of Higher Education, and State Dept. of Education is involved.	Pennsylvania Dept. of Education	State Board of Education
Source/level of funding	Special grant from Chapter 2 ECIA in addition to local funds. Total approximately $15,000 annually.	State allocation from legislature.	No information provided.
Program goals/foci:	"As presently designed it is to give teachers the assistance they need to function effectively in an ever more demanding school environment. The aim of the support system is to assure effective schools by assuring effective teachers." (Schalock, 1983, p. 1)	No specific information provided; creation of an induction period is to be one element of a "total restructuring of teacher education and certification." (Kautz, pers. comm., 1983)	Intent of the Board Resolution "is to assess beginning teachers in seven competency areas..." These areas are: 1. Organization 2. Evaluation of student performance 3. Recognition of individual difference 4. Cultural awareness 5. Understanding of the nature of the youth 6. Management 7. Educational policies and procedures. Goals are: 1. To identify beginning teachers who do not meet minimum standards, and 2. To provide feedback to beginning teachers to facilitate improvement of instructional performance. (Draft, Summary of Performance-Based Assessment and Assistance Program for Beginning Teachers, pp. 1-2.)

BEST COPY

Table 3, continued.

	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Virginia
Program clients/ consumers	Teachers entering the district, especially first year teachers; teachers encountering job changes.	All new professional educators during the first year of professional employment.	All initially certified teachers (must participate for two years); teachers from out-of-state with less than three years of successful employment within the last seven years from anticipated date of employment in Virginia.
Composition of support/assessment teams	To be designed by each participating district within guidelines	Proposal recommends that Pa. DOE develop guidelines for this purpose.	Provisions made for the utilization of several assessors for each teacher, and to receive counseling and advice.
Training for support/ assessment teams	No information in available materials.	No information in available materials.	Assessors will be trained.
Training/orientation for the beginning teacher	No information in available materials.	No information in available materials.	No information in available materials.
Team role in assessment	No information in available materials.	No information in available materials.	Not specified; however, there will be multiple assessors for each beginning teacher.
Focus in assessment	No information in available materials.	No information in available materials.	Seven competency areas: 1. organization 2. evaluation of student performance 3. recognition of individual difference 4. cultural awareness 5. understanding of the nature of youth 6. management 7. educational policies and procedures.
Instrumentation	No information in available materials.	No information in available materials.	To be developed; provision is made for more than one method of data gathering.
Provision of feedback	No information in available materials.	No information in available materials.	To be developed: "a system that provides immediate feedback to beginning teachers." (Draft, p. 3)
Mechanisms for providing assistance	No information in available materials.	No information in available materials.	"...each beginning teacher will receive counseling and advice to improve instruction regardless of the initial level of performance." (Draft, p. 5)

BEST COPY

Table 3, continued.

	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Virginia
Certification outcomes	No information in available materials.	Successful completion of induction program during first or second year of teaching will be an eligibility requirement for the Level II certificate.	Demonstration of competence in all seven areas during the first two years of employment are necessary to obtain five-year, renewable Collegiate Professional Certificate.